

REMARKS

Claims 1-20, 23-51 were pending as of the action mailed on April 10, 2007. Claims 1, 9, 13, 30, 38, 42, and 50 are in independent form. This response is being filed with a Request for Continued Examination.

Claims 1, 9, 13, 30, 38, 42, and 50 are being amended. Claims 10, 15, 25, and 32 are being cancelled. No new matter has been added.

Reexamination of the application and reconsideration of the action are respectfully requested in light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Examiner's Response to Arguments

In the action mailed April 10, 2007, the examiner responded to the applicant's earlier arguments as follows:

2. Applicant's arguments filed 7/14/2006 with respect to claims 1-20, 23-51 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

3. Upon further consideration of the cited references a new rejection has been provided by way of a new interpretation of those references. This new interpretation takes into account a previous oversight of the basic workings of email within a computer system which provides for an email program (1st application) which creates emails (container objects) and provides these emails to OS applications such as Winsock (2nd application) for sending to a recipient.

The applicant has amended all the independent claims to recite that the second application is an e-mail client application or a Web browser application. Therefore, the second application cannot be an OS application such as Winsock. In addition, because all the independent claims recite that the second application is distinct from the first application, if the first application is an e-mail client application, then the second application must be a Web browser application.

Finally and independent of the preceding two points, the first application cannot be an e-mail application because each of the independent claims recite features not found in e-mail applications. Claim 1 recites that the first application has instructions to perform all the

operations recited in the claim, including generating a first container object containing a sender's certificate or a request for a recipient's certificate, using a second application (an e-mail client or a Web browser) to transmit the first container object to a recipient, automatically obtaining a second container object from the second application, and automatically identifying and extracting one or more certificates. Similarly, claim 9 is directed the first application recited as a computer program product, which recites that the first application includes instructions for obtaining the container object from the second application (an e-mail client or a Web browser), recognizing that the container object may include a certificate of a sender, and automatically determining if the container object contains a certificate of the sender. Similarly, claim 13 recites that the first application includes instructions for automatically obtaining a container object from a second application (an e-mail client or a Web browser), recognizing that the container object may include a request for a certificate, automatically determining if the container object includes a request for a certificate, and if so, responding to the request. Similarly, claim 30 recites a method in which the first application is used to generate a container object, which has a recognizable container type that is associated with the first application, and which contains a sender's certificate or a request for a recipient's certificate, where generating the container object includes putting the certificate or request in the object, and in which the first application is also invoked to automatically identify and extract one or more certificates from within a second container object. Claim 38 corresponds to claim 9. Claim 42 corresponds to claim 13. And finally, claim 50 corresponds to a combination of claim 1 and claim 13.

For each of the foregoing reasons, the applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of the independent claims and their respective dependent claims should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the applicant submits that all the claims are in condition for allowance.

By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular positions taken by the examiner, the applicant does not acquiesce with other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, the applicant's selecting some particular arguments for the patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that

claim exist. Finally, the applicant's decision to amend or cancel any claim should not be understood as implying that the applicant agrees with any positions taken by the examiner with respect to that claim or other claims.

Please apply any charges not otherwise paid or any credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 10, 2007

/Brian J. Gustafson/
Brian J. Gustafson
Reg. No. 52,978

Customer No. 21876
Fish & Richardson P.C.
Telephone: (650) 839-5070
Facsimile: (650) 839-5071